## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)   |  |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 10/565,478      | TOMALIA ET AL. |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit       |  |
| LAAIIIIIEI      | Art Unit       |  |

| <del>-</del>   |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
|  | Elizabeth Robinson   | 1787   |   |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ears on the cover sheet with the   | correspondence add   | lress                                     |  |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>06 July 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP  | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A  | LLOWANCE.  |   |  |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:  | replies: (1) an amendment, affida<br>eal (with appeal fee) in compliance   | vit, or other evidence, we with 37 CFR 41.31; o              | vhich places the r (3) a Request          |  |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date  | of the final rejection.  |  |   |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07)   | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set fort<br>ater than SIX MONTHS from the maili<br>(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH       | ng date of the final rejection                               | on.                                       |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amoun<br>shortened statutory period for reply ori<br>than three months after the mailing d | t of the fee. The appropri<br>ginally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee<br>be action; or (2) as |  |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp<br/>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter<br/>Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w<br/>AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>  | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), t   | o avoid dismissal of the                                     |   |  |
| 3. 🔯 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  | but prior to the date of filing a brie   | f. will not be entered be                                    | ecause                                    |  |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  |  |  |   |  |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo  | w);  |  |   |  |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet  | ter form for appeal by materially re   | educing or simplifying t                                     | he issues for                             |  |
| appeal; and/or   |  | :t  - -:   |   |  |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a   | -  | jected ciaims.   |   |  |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1  |  | anan lian t Anaan dhaan t                                    | DTOL 224)                                 |  |
| <ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ol>   |  | ompliant Amendment (   | PTOL-324).                                |  |
| 5. Mapplicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Mewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the   |  |  |   |  |
| non-allowable claim(s).  | lowable il submitted in a separate   | timely filed afficilities                                    | nit cancelling the                        |  |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |  |  |   |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:  |  |  |   |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>12,13,27,32 and 37-39</u> .  |  |  |   |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-9,14-26,28-31 and 33-36</u> .  |  |  |   |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |  |  |   |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   | d sufficient reasons why the affida  | vit or other evidence is                                     | necessary and                             |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>  | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe  | eal and/or appellant fail                                    | s to provide a                            |  |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.   |  |  |   |  |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  |  |  |   |  |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.   |  | in condition for allowan                                     | ce because:                               |  |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. ☑ Other: <u>See attached PTO-892</u> .  | (P10/SB/08) Paper No(s)  |  |   |  |
| /Callie E. Shosho/   | /E. R./  |  |   |  |
| Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1787   | Elizabeth Robinson<br>Examiner, Art Unit 178   | 7  |   |  |
|  |  |  |   |  |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to independent claim 12 add new limitations, not previously claimed, that would require further consideration and search. The nanoparticles must now be attached to the dendrons though the focal point of the dendron. Further, the attached groups must now not quench the photoluminescence of the composition. These limitations were not previously claimed.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection of record, it appears that the cited section of the specification (using the article 34 specification amendment) supports the previously filed claim limitation. Thus, the 35 U.S.C., 112 first paragraph rejections of record are withdrawn. However, it is noted that if the claim amendments were entered, there would be a new 35 U.S.C., 112 first paragraph rejection over the limitation that the photoluminescence of the composition is not quenched. It appears that the component that has photoluminescence is the nanoparticle, not the composition.

Applicant argues that since the materials used to form the nanoparticle can form quantum dots and that quantum dots have photoluminescence, that the nanoparticles will have photoluminescence. However, the particles are claimed as nanoparticles, not as quantum dots and thus, can be of a larger size and not necessarily have photoluminescent properties.

The arguments regarding Vossmeyer et al. (US 2003/0109056) are primarily directed to the claim amendment regarding the attach point of the nanoparticle. The claim amendments are not entered.

Further, regarding the Vossmeyer reference, Applicant argues that tetrachloroethylene has an odor, not a fragrance. However, as evidenced by the Perchloroethylene fact sheet (Page 2), perchloroethylene is also called tetrachloroethylene and has a sweetish smell. This would fall under definition 2 of the definition of fragrance provided by Applicants.

Continuation of 13. Other: Attached is form PTO-892 to provide a reference to address Applicant's arguments regarding fragrance.